OMB Approval Number: 2050-0095
Approved for Use Through: 4/95

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

1. General Site Information

Name:		Street Address:			
NAVISTAR		6125 URBANA ROAD			
City:	State:	Zip Code:	County:	Co. Code:	Cong. Dist:
SPRINGFIELD	OH	45501	CLARK	23	7
Latitude: Longitude:	Approx. Area of Site:		Status of Site:		
40° 1' 10.0" 83° 51' 32.0"	200 acres		Active		

2. Owner/Operator Information

Owner:			Operator:		
NAVISTAR INTERNATIONAL COPRORATION			NAVISTAR INTERNATIONAL CORPORATION		
Street Address:			Street Address:		
6125 URBANA ROAD			6125 URBANA ROAD		
City:			City:		
SPRINGFIELD			SPRINGFIELD		
State:	Zip Code:	Telephone:	State:	Zip Code:	Telephone:
OH	45501	(513)390-2800	OH	45501	(513)390-2800
Type of Ownership:			How Initially Identified:		
Private			State/Local Program		

CONFIDENTIAL

96

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

3. Site Evaluator Information

Name of Evaluator:	Agency/Organization:	Date Prepared:
PETER LOWRY	OEPA/SWDO/DERR	5-6-93

Street Address:	City:	State:
40 SOUTH MAIN STREET	DAYTON	OH

Name of EPA or State Agency Contact:	Telephone:
TIM HULL	(513)285-6357

Street Address:	City:	State:
40 SOUTH MAIN STREET	DAYTON	OH

4. Site Disposition (for EPA use only)

Emergency Response/Removal Assessment Recommendation:	CERCLIS Recommendation:	Signature:
Date:	Date:	Name:
		Position:

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

5. General Site Characteristics

Predominant Land Uses Within 1 Mile of Site:	Site Setting:	Years of Operation:
Commercial Forest/Fields Agricultural	Rural	Beginning Year: 1964 Ending Year: PRESENT

Type of Site Operations:	Waste Generated:
Manufacturing Paints, Varnishes Industrial Organic Chemicals Fabricated Structural Metal Products	Onsite
	Waste Deposition Authorized By: Present Owner
	Waste Accessible to the Public: No
	Distance to Nearest Dwelling, School, or Workplace: 1000 Feet

6. Waste Characteristics Information

Source Type	Quantity	Tier
Drums	6.50e+03 drums	V
Pile	1.00e+00 acres	A
Contaminated soil	2.25e+04 cu ft	V

Tier Legend
C = Constituent W = Wastestream
V = Volume A = Area

General Types of Waste:
Organics
Acids/Bases
Oily Waste

Physical State of Waste as Deposited
Liquid

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

7. Ground Water Pathway

Is Ground Water Used for Drinking Water Within 4 Miles: YES Type of Ground Water Wells Within 4 Miles: Municipal, Private	Is There a Suspected Release to Ground Water: Yes Have Primary Target Drinking Water Wells Been Identified: No	List Secondary Target Population Served by Ground Water Withdrawn From:
Depth to Shallowest Aquifer: 9 Feet Karst Terrain/Aquifer Present: No	Nearest Designated Wellhead Protection Area: Underlies Site	0 - 1/4 Mile 10 >1/4 - 1/2 Mile 29 >1/2 - 1 Mile 11 >1 - 2 Miles 75 >2 - 3 Miles 127 >3 - 4 Miles 71052 Total 71304

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 1 of 4

Type of Surface Water Draining Site and 15 Miles Downstream:	Shortest Overland Distance From Any Source to Surface Water:
Stream River Pond	1 Feet 0.0 Miles
Is there a Suspected Release to Surface Water: No	Site is Located in: Annual - 10 yr floodplain

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 2 of 4

Drinking Water Intakes Along the Surface Water Migration Path: No

Have Primary Target Drinking Water Intakes Been Identified: No

Secondary Target Drinking Water Intakes:
None

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 3 of 4

Fisheries Located Along the Surface Water Migration Path: Yes

Have Primary Target Fisheries Been Identified: No

Secondary Target Fisheries:

Fishery Name	Water Body Type/Flow(cfs)
Mad River	small-moderate stream/ 10-100

8. Surface Water Pathway — Part 4 of 4

Wetlands Located Along the Surface Water Migration Path? (y/n) No

Have Primary Target Wetlands Been Identified? (y/n) No

Secondary Target Wetlands:
None

Other Sensitive Environments Along the Surface Water Migration Path: No

Have Primary Target Sensitive Environments Been Identified: No

Secondary Target Sensitive Environments:
None

POTENTIAL HAZARDOUS WASTE SITE PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FORM	IDENTIFICATION	
	State: OH	CERCLIS Number: OHD049645120
	CERCLIS Discovery Date: 4-22-88	

9. Soil Exposure Pathway

Are People Occupying Residences or Attending School or Daycare on or Within 200 Feet of Areas of Known or Suspected Contamination: No	Number of Workers Onsite: > 1000

Have Terrestrial Sensitive Environments Been Identified on or Within 200 Feet of Areas of Known or Suspected Contamination: NO

Terrestrial Sensitive Environments:

Critical habitat for Federally designated endang/threat species
Habitat used by Federal designated endangered/threatened species
Critical habitat for Federally designated endang/threat species
Critical habitat for Federally designated endang/threat species
Critical habitat for Federally designated endang/threat species

10. Air Pathway

Total Population on or Within:	
Onsite	5370
0 - 1/4 Mile	12
>1/4 - 1/2 Mile	16
>1/2 - 1 Mile	124
>1 - 2 Miles	2149
>2 - 3 Miles	5756
>3 - 4 Miles	6238
Total	19665

Is There a Suspected Release to Air: No

Wetlands Located Within 4 Miles of the Site: No

Other Sensitive Environments Located Within 4 Miles of the Site: YES

Sensitive Environments Within 1/2 Mile of the Site:
None

OMB Approval Number: 2050-0095
Approved for Use Through: 4/95

PA-Score

PA Scoresheets

Site Name: NAVISTAR
CERCLIS ID No.: OHD049645120
Street Address: 6125 URBANA ROAD
City/State/Zip: SPRINGFIELD, OH 45501

Investigator: PETER LOWRY
Agency/Organization: OEPA/SWDO/DERR
Street Address: 40 SOUTH MAIN STREET
City/State: DAYTON, OH

Date: 5-6-93

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

Waste Characteristics (WC) Calculations:

1 SOUTH TANK FARM	Drums		Ref: 3	WQ value	maximum
Volume	6.50E+03 drums			6.50E+02	6.50E+02

The South Tank Farm has ten decommissioned underground storage tanks with sizes ranging from 3 to 10 thousand gallons each. These tanks stored virgin gasoline, diesel fuel, antifreeze, paints and solvents. Soil and groundwater samples taken showed elevated levels of benzene, methylene, ethylbenzene, toluene, chloride, chloroform, 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane, oil and grease, acetone, xylene, and mixed alkyl benzenes. Waste volume was calculated based on an average tank volume of 6500 gallons times 10 tanks.
Ref: 3

2 SOIL LAND FARM AREA	Pile		Ref: 3	WQ value	maximum
Area	1.00E+00 acres			3.45E+03	3.45E+03

The Soil Land Farm is where the contaminated soil from the STF was laid, expecting the organic contaminants would biodegrade. This was done in July 1985. This area is diked and lined with two layers of Visqueen. A built-in sump collects water and pumps it to the plant's treatment system, where it is discharged through two ponds, and eventually goes into the drainage ditch.
Ref: 3

3 NORTH TANK FARM	Contaminated soil		Ref: 3	WQ value	maximum
Volume	2.25E+04 cu ft			3.33E-01	3.33E-01

The North Tank Farm has had all of its five 8,000 gallon steel tanks removed. Soil samples taken from the NTF indicated petroleum hydrocarbon contaminants along with low levels of volatile organic compounds. The amount of contaminated soil was estimated based on contamination reaching five feet below the base of the pit with the pit's dimensions being 75 feet by 60 feet.
Ref: 3

WQ total 4.10E+03

** Only First WC Page Is Printed ** | Waste Characteristics Score: WC = 32

Ground Water Pathway Criteria List Suspected Release	
Are sources poorly contained? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the source a type likely to contribute to ground water contamination (e.g., wet lagoon)? (y/n/u)	Y
Is waste quantity particularly large? (y/n/u)	N
Is precipitation heavy? (y/n/u)	N
Is the infiltration rate high? (y/n/u)	Y
Is the site located in an area of karst terrain? (y/n)	N
Is the subsurface highly permeable or conductive? (y/n/u)	Y
Is drinking water drawn from a shallow aquifer? (y/n/u)	Y
Are suspected contaminants highly mobile in ground water? (y/n/u)	Y
Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest ground water contamination? (y/n/u)	Y
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	Y

Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:

Lab results from soil and groundwater samples taken in the North and South Tank Farm showed the presence of benzene, methylene chloride, chloroform, 1,1,2,2-tetrachloroethane, ethylbenzene, toluene, and oil and grease. Ground-water in the area of the South Tank Farm also had acetone, xylene, and mixed alkyl benzenes. The reason for these contaminants were tank overflows and spills. The site is over the Mad River Buried Valley aquifer, which the city of Springfield wellfield uses as its sole source of drinking water. The aquifer is very shallow, being only 9 feet below grade in some locations.

Ref: 3

Ground Water Pathway Criteria List
Primary Targets

Is any drinking water well nearby? (y/n/u)	N
Has any nearby drinking water well been closed? (y/n/u)	N
Has any nearby drinking water well user reported foul-testing or foul-smelling water? (y/n/u)	N
Does any nearby well have a large drawdown/high production rate? (y/n/u)	N
Is any drinking water well located between the site and other wells that are suspected to be exposed to a hazardous substance? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest contamination at a drinking water well? (y/n/u)	N
Does any drinking water well warrant sampling? (y/n/u)	N

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY TARGET(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Targets:

The contaminants from the site have been proven to be localized to the area beneath the site. There is no suspected contamination at any drinking water wells.

Ref: 3

GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics

		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/n)	Yes	
Is the site located in karst terrain? (y/n)	No	
Depth to aquifer (feet):	9	3
Distance to the nearest drinking water well (feet):	1720	6

LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
1. SUSPECTED RELEASE	550		
2. NO SUSPECTED RELEASE		0	
LR =	550	0	

Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		
4. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION Are any wells part of a blended system? (y/n) N	423	0	
5. NEAREST WELL	20	0	
6. WELLHEAD PROTECTION AREA Underlies Site	20	0	
7. RESOURCES	5	0	
T =	468	0	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

WC =	32	0

GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORE: 100

Ground Water Target Populations

Primary Target Population Drinking Water Well ID	Dist. (miles)	Population Served	Reference	Value
None				

*** Note : Maximum of 5 Wells Are Printed *** Total

Secondary Target Population Distance Categories	Population Served	Reference	Value
0 to 1/4 mile	10	2	1
Greater than 1/4 to 1/2 mile	29	2	1
Greater than 1/2 to 1 mile	11	2	1
Greater than 1 to 2 miles	75	2	1
Greater than 2 to 3 miles	127	2	2
Greater than 3 to 4 miles	71052	2	417
		Total	423

Apportionment Documentation for a Blended System

Surface Water Pathway Criteria List Suspected Release	
Is surface water nearby? (y/n/u)	Y
Is waste quantity particularly large? (y/n/u)	N
Is the drainage area large? (y/n/u)	N
Is rainfall heavy? (y/n/u)	N
Is the infiltration rate low? (y/n/u)	N
Are sources poorly contained or prone to runoff or flooding? (y/n/u)	N
Is a runoff route well defined(e.g.ditch/channel to surf.water)? (y/n/u)	Y
Is vegetation stressed along the probable runoff path? (y/n/u)	N
Are sediments or water unnaturally discolored? (y/n/u)	N
Is wildlife unnaturally absent? (y/n/u)	N
Has deposition of waste into surface water been observed? (y/n/u)	N
Is ground water discharge to surface water likely? (y/n/u)	Y
Does analytical/circumstantial evidence suggest S.W. contam? (y/n/u)	N
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	N

Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:

There is no suspected release to surface water. The North Tank Farm has been removed, the South Tank Farm is no longer in operation and NAVISTAR is awaiting BUSTR's permission to remove it from the ground. The Soil Land Farm has a dike surrounding it and is lined with two layers of Visqueen. The Soil Land Farm also has a built-in sump, which collects water and pumps it to the plant's treatment facility.

Ref: 3, 7

Surface Water Pathway Criteria List
Primary Targets

Is any target nearby? (y/n/u) If yes: N
N Drinking water intake
N Fishery
N Sensitive environment

Has any intake, fishery, or recreational area been closed? (y/n/u) N

Does analytical or circumstantial evidence suggest surface water contamination at or downstream of a target? (y/n/u) N

Does any target warrant sampling? (y/n/u) If yes: N
N Drinking water intake
N Fishery
N Sensitive environment

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY INTAKE(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Intakes:

There are no surface water intakes within the target distance limit around the site.

Ref: 1, 3
continued -------

continued -------

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY FISHERY(IES) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Fisheries:

Ref:

Other criteria? (y/n) N

PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENT(S) IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Primary Sensitive Environments:

Ref:

SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/n)	No	
Distance to surface water (feet):	1	1
Flood frequency (years):	1-10	
What is the downstream distance (miles) to:		
a. the nearest drinking water intake?	N.A.	
b. the nearest fishery?	3.0	1
c. the nearest sensitive environment?	1.0	5

LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
1. SUSPECTED RELEASE	0		
2. NO SUSPECTED RELEASE		500	
LR =	0	500	

Drinking Water Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. Determine the water body type, flow (if applicable), and number of people served by each drinking water intake.			
4. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		
5. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION Are any intakes part of a blended system? (y/n): N	0	0	
6. NEAREST INTAKE	0	0	
7. RESOURCES	0	5	
T =	0	5	

Drinking Water Threat Target Populations

Intake Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Population Served	Ref.	Value
None					

Total Primary Target Population Value	0
Total Secondary Target Population Value	0

*** Note : Maximum of 6 Intakes Are Printed ***

Apportionment Documentation for a Blended System

Human Food Chain Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
8. Determine the water body type and flow for each fishery within the target limit.			
9. PRIMARY FISHERIES	0		
10. SECONDARY FISHERIES	0	30	
T =	0	30	

Human Food Chain Threat Targets

Fishery Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Ref.	Value
1 Mad River	N	10-100 cfs	3	30

Total Primary Fisheries Value 0
Total Secondary Fisheries Value 0

*** Note : Maximum of 6 Fisheries Are Printed ***

Environmental Threat Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
11. Determine the water body type and flow (if applicable) for each sensitive environment.			
12. PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTS	0		
13. SECONDARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0	0	
T =	0	0	

Environmental Threat Targets

Sensitive Environment Name	Primary (y/n)	Water Body Type/Flow	Ref.	Value
None				

Total Primary Sensitive Environments Value 0
Total Secondary Sensitive Environments Value 0

*** Note: Maximum of 6 Sensitive Environments Are Printed ***

Surface Water Pathway Threat Scores

Threat	Likelihood of Release(LR) Score	Targets(T) Score	Pathway Waste Characteristics (WC) Score	Threat Score LR x T x WC / 82,500
Drinking Water	500	5	32	1
Human Food Chain	500	30	32	6
Environmental	500	0	32	0

SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORE: 7

Soil Exposure Pathway Criteria List
Resident Population

Is any residence, school, or daycare facility on or within 200 feet of an area of suspected contamination? (y/n/u)	N
Is any residence, school, or daycare facility located on adjacent land previously owned or leased by the site owner/operator? (y/n/u)	N
Is there a migration route that might spread hazardous substances near residences, schools, or daycare facilities? (y/n/u)	N
Have onsite or adjacent residents or students reported adverse health effects, exclusive of apparent drinking water or air contamination problems? (y/n/u)	N
Does any neighboring property warrant sampling? (y/n/u)	N

Other criteria? (y/n) N

RESIDENT POPULATION IDENTIFIED? (y/n) N

Summarize the rationale for Resident Population:

There is no resident population concerning the Navistar site, because there are no people living close enough to the site to be affected by the contamination at the site. The workers at the site are not considered in this part of the PA.

Ref: 3

Soil Exposure Pathway Terrestrial Sensitive Environments

	Terrestrial Sensitive Environment Name	Reference	Value
1	Potentially Threatened Plant	5	100
2	Special Interest Animal	5	75
3	Endangered/Threatened Animal	5	100
4	Endangered/Threatened Animal	5	100
5	Endangered/Threatened Animal	5	100
	Total Terrestrial Sensitive Environments Value		475

*** Note : Maximum of 7 Sensitive Environments Are Printed ***

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics		Ref.
Do any people live on or within 200 ft of areas of suspected contamination? (y/n)	No	7
Do any people attend school or daycare on or within 200 ft of areas of suspected contamination? (y/n)	No	7
Is the facility active? (y/n):	Yes	3

LIKELIHOOD OF EXPOSURE	Suspected Contamination	References
1. SUSPECTED CONTAMINATION LE =	550	

Targets

2. RESIDENT POPULATION 0 resident(s) 0 school/daycare student(s)	0	
3. RESIDENT INDIVIDUAL	0	
4. WORKERS >1000	15	3
5. TERRES. SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTS	475	
6. RESOURCES	5	
T =	495	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

WC = 32

RESIDENT POPULATION THREAT SCORE: 100

NEARBY POPULATION THREAT SCORE: 1

Population Within 1 Mile: 1 - 10,000

SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE: 100

Air Pathway Criteria List
Suspected Release

Are odors currently reported? (y/n/u)	N
Has release of a hazardous substance to the air been directly observed? (y/n/u)	N
Are there reports of adverse health effects (e.g., headaches, nausea, dizziness) potentially resulting from migration of hazardous substances through the air? (y/n/u)	N
Does analytical/circumstantial evidence suggest release to air? (y/n/u)	N
Other criteria? (y/n) N	
SUSPECTED RELEASE? (y/n)	N

Summarize the rationale for Suspected Release:

There is no suspected release to the air.

Ref: 3

AIR PATHWAY SCORESHEETS

Pathway Characteristics

		Ref.
Do you suspect a release? (y/n)	No	
Distance to the nearest individual (feet):	1000	7

LIKELIHOOD OF RELEASE	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
1. SUSPECTED RELEASE	0		
2. NO SUSPECTED RELEASE		500	
LR =	0	500	

Targets

TARGETS	Suspected Release	No Suspected Release	References
3. PRIMARY TARGET POPULATION 0 person(s)	0		
4. SECONDARY TARGET POPULATION	0	526	
5. NEAREST INDIVIDUAL	0	20	
6. PRIMARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0		
7. SECONDARY SENSITIVE ENVIRONS.	0	0	
8. RESOURCES	0	5	
T =	0	551	

WASTE CHARACTERISTICS

WC =	0	32

AIR PATHWAY SCORE:	100

Air Pathway Secondary Target Populations

Distance Categories	Population	References	Value
Onsite	5370	3	521
Greater than 0 to 1/4 mile	12	4	1
Greater than 1/4 to 1/2 mile	16	4	0
Greater than 1/2 to 1 mile	124	4	1
Greater than 1 to 2 miles	2149	4	1
Greater than 2 to 3 miles	5756	4	1
Greater than 3 to 4 miles	6238	4	1
		Total Secondary Population Value	526

Air Pathway Primary Sensitive Environments

Sensitive Environment Name	Reference	Value
None		
Total Primary Sensitive Environments Value		

*** Note : Maximum of 7 Sensitive Environments Are Printed***

Air Pathway Secondary Sensitive Environments

Sensitive Environment Name	Distance	Reference	Value
None			
Total Secondary Sensitive Environments Value			

SITE SCORE CALCULATION	SCORE
GROUND WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	100
SURFACE WATER PATHWAY SCORE:	7
SOIL EXPOSURE PATHWAY SCORE:	100
AIR PATHWAY SCORE:	100
SITE SCORE:	87

SUMMARY

1. Is there a high possibility of a threat to any nearby drinking water well(s) by migration of a hazardous substance in ground water? No

   If yes, identify the well(s).

   If yes, how many people are served by the threatened well(s)? 0

2. Is there a high possibility of a threat to any of the following by hazardous substance migration in surface water?
   A. Drinking water intake No
   B. Fishery No
   C. Sensitive environment (wetland, critical habitat, others) No

   If yes, identity the target(s).

3. Is there a high possibility of an area of surficial contamination within 200 feet of any residence, school, or daycare facility? No

   If yes, identify the properties and estimate the associated population(s)

4. Are there public health concerns at this site that are not addressed by PA scoring considerations? No

   If yes, explain:

REFERENCE LIST

1. USGS TOPO MAPS: SPRINGFIELD QUAD (1955), NEW MOORFIELD QUAD (1965), URBANA EAST QUAD (1973 PHOTOREVISED), URBANA WEST (1973 PHOTOREVISED)

2. INTEROFFICE COMMUNICATION FROM LAURA FAY
RE: TIGER POPULATION ESTIMATES
MARCH 25, 1993

3. NAVISTAR INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION
REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND FEASIBILITY STUDY
PREPARED BY ERM MIDWEST, JANUARY 15, 1993

4. SENSITIVE ENVIRONMENTS MAP OF CLARK COUNTY OHIO MARCH 27, 1993

5. ODNR WELL LOGS AND MAPS

6. SITE VISIT BY PETER LOWRY AND TIM HULL OF OHIO EPA/SWDO DERR ON APRIL 1, 1993

7. TELEPHONE CONVERSATION WITH JULIE WILLIAMS OF BUSTR, COLUMBUS OFFICE, MARCH 31, 1993

8. NAVISTAR INTERNATIONAL TRANSPORTATION CORPORATION REMEDIAL INVESTIGATION AND REMEDIAL ACTIONS AT THE SOUTH TANK FARM PREPARED BY BOWSER-MORNER INC. OCTOBER 1987

9. OHIO EPA EMERGENCY RESPONSE REPORT ON SPILL NUMBER 9005-12-2249 MAY 7, 1993

10. OHIO DATA USERS CENTER REPORT ON 1990 CENCUS OF POPULATION AND HOUSING ISSUED AUGUST 1991

11. PHONE CONVERSATION WITH AL WANSING CITY OF SPRINGFIELD WATER DISTRIBUTION PLANT 4-29-93

12. PHONE CONVERSATION WITH TIM MCDANIEL ENVIRONMENTAL MANAGER AT NAVISTAR MAY 3, 1993